<div align="center">

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

</div>

In re Application of: Haraldur THORKELSSON *et al.*	Confirmation No.: 3542
Application No.: 10/579,610	Examiner: Bhatia, Ajay M.
Filed: May 17, 2006	Group Art Unit: 2445

For: WIRELESS E-MAIL SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR USING SAME

Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

<div align="center">

APPEAL BRIEF

</div>

Dear Sir:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal dated March 23, 2011.

I.   REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Nokia Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of Finland and having a place of business at Keilalahdentie 4, FIN-02150 Espoo, Finland. The above referenced patent application is assigned to Nokia Corporation.

II.   RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals and interferences.

III.   STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1 through 34 are pending in this Application. Claims 35 through 37 have been canceled. Claims 1 through 34 have been previously presented. No claims are original.

<div align="center">1</div>

Claims 1 through 34 were finally rejected in an Office Action dated December 23, 2010. It is from the final rejection of claims 1 through 34 on December 23, 2010, that this Appeal is taken.

IV.   STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No Amendment has been filed subsequent to the issuance of the Final Office Action on December 23, 2010.

V.   SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claimed invention addresses problems associated with wireless mobile e-mail technology. In conventional systems, e-mail traffic appears in the mobile network as data traffic and is not distinguishable from other types of traffic such as, for example, web browsing. Mobile operators were not able to monitor the usage or provide specific subscriptions based on such e-mail services. The problem of the conventional systems result as a consequence of the IMAP and POP3 protocols, which were conceived originally for use over landline networks where latency is low, bandwidth relatively cheap, and network availability high.

The claimed invention provides a solution to this problem by providing for a novel wireless e-mail system which allows for a wireless mobile device to support a thin client for e-mail functions, with most of the processing offloaded to an external platform that is not significantly constrained by memory, processing capability, or power supply. In contrast to the standard e-mail protocols that require multiple transactions and significant processing on the part of a client to extract required information, the client of the present invention initiates a request in a format that allows it to retrieve the required information to be displayed in a single request/response pair. In addition, the client device of the present invention is not required to

maintain a persistent session with the e-mail server, or the gateway, in order to initiate subsequent transactions, as is required by IMAP and POP3 protocols, because each request is self-contained, eliminating any need for client-specific information to be stored in the gateway. Thus, a single, sessionless request/response pair over HTTP is used for each of those transactions initiated by the client.

Independent claim 1 recites:

1. A system, comprising:

a server (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0012], [0029], [0035], [0046]; FIGs. 1A, 1B; FIG. 4; FIG. 5, servers 18); and

a gateway (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0012], [0028], [0035], [0046]; FIGs. 1A, 1B; FIG. 4; FIG. 5, gateway 16), wherein a wireless network (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0012], [0035]; FIGs. 1A, 1B, network 14) interconnects a device (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0012], [0021], [0035], [0046], [0047]; FIGs. 1A, 1B; FIG. 2; FIG. 4, device 12) and said gateway, the device comprising a communication client, wherein a broadband network interconnects said gateway and said server; wherein when said client transmits a single self-contained request (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0053]-[0055], [0057]-[0063]; FIG. 3A, single request/response pair 30; FIG. 4, interfaces A, B) to said gateway via said wireless network to retrieve a set of e-mail related information from said server, said gateway retrieves at least said e-mail related information from said server via said broadband network using a plurality of transactions taking place between the gateway and the server (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0056]-[0062]; FIG. 4, interface A; FIG. 6, step 70; FIG. 7A, 54), compiles said retrieved information into a single self contained response and transmits said single response via said wireless network to said

communication client (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0050]-[0055], [0057]-[0063]; FIG. 3A, single request/response pair 30; FIG. 4, interfaces A).

Independent claim 10 recites:

10. An apparatus comprising:

at least one processor (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0012], [0021], [0035], [0046], [0047]; FIGs. 1A, 1B; FIG. 2; FIG. 4, processor can be in device 12, for example); and

at least one memory including computer program code for one or more programs, the at least one memory and the computer program code configured to, with the at least one processor (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0012], [0021], [0035], [0046], [0047]; FIGs. 1A, 1B; FIG. 2; FIG. 4, memory can be in device 12, for example), cause the apparatus to perform at least the following,

receive from a client application of a device, via a wireless network, a single self-contained request at a first interface, wherein said first interface is interconnected with said wireless network (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0053]-[0055], [0057]-[0063]; FIG. 3A, single request/response pair 30; FIG. 4, interface A),

retrieve at least said e-mail related information from an e-mail server via a second interface (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0053]-[0055], [0057]-[0063]; FIG. 3A, single request/response pair 30; FIG. 4, interface B) and a broadband network using a plurality of transactions taking place between the apparatus and the server, wherein said second interface is interconnected with said broadband network (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0056]-[0062]; FIG. 4, interface B; FIG. 6, step 70; FIG. 7A, 54),

determine to compile said retrieved information into a single self contained response (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0050]-[0055], [0057]-[0063]; FIG. 3A, single request/response pair 30; FIG. 4, interfaces A, B; FIG. 6, step 70), and

determine to transmit said single response via said first interface and the mobile network to the communication client (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0050]-[0055], [0057]-[0063]; FIG. 3A, single request/response pair 30; FIG. 1A, mobile network 14; FIG. 4, interface A, client 12).

Independent claim 15 recites:

15. A method comprising:

receiving, via a wireless network, a single request for e-mail related information, wherein the single request is formed in a client application at a device (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0053]-[0055], [0057]-[0063]; FIG. 1, device 12, wireless network 14; FIG. 3A, single request/response pair 30; FIG. 4, interfaces A, B);

retrieving at least the e-mail related information from a server via a broadband network using a plurality of transactions taking place with the server (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0056]-[0062]; FIGs. 1A, 1B, network 14; FIG. 4; FIG. 5, servers 18; FIG. 6, step 70; FIG. 7A, 54);

determining to compile said retrieved information into a single response (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0050]-[0055], [0057]-[0063]; FIG. 3A, single request/response pair 30; FIG. 4, interfaces A, B; FIG. 6, step 70); and

determining to transmit said single response to said client application via said wireless network (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0050]-[0055], [0057]-[0063]; FIG. 3A,

single request/response pair 30; FIG. 1A, mobile network 14; FIG. 4, interface A, client 12).

Independent claim 25 recites:

25. A method comprising:

receiving from a client application in a device, via a wireless network, a single request at a first stateless interface for the e-mail related information, wherein said first stateless interface is interconnected with said wireless network (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0050]-[0055], [0057]-[0063]; FIG. 3A, single request/response pair 30; FIG. 1A, mobile network 14; FIG. 4, interface A, client 12)

retrieving at least the requested e-mail related information from a server via a second interface and a broadband network using a plurality of transactions taking place with the server, wherein said second interface is interconnected with said broadband network (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0056]-[0062]; FIGs. 1A, 1B, server 18, network 14; FIG. 4, second interface B; FIG. 5, servers 18; FIG. 6, step 70; FIG. 7A, 54);

determining to compile said retrieved information into a single response (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0050]-[0055], [0057]-[0063]; FIG. 3A, single request/response pair 30; FIG. 4, interfaces A, B; FIG. 6, step 70); and

determining to transmit said single response to said client application via said first interface and said wireless network (See, e.g., Specification ¶¶ [0047], [0050]-[0055], [0057]-[0063]; FIG. 3A, single request/response pair 30; FIG. 1A, mobile network 14; FIG. 4, interface A, client 12).

VI.   GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A. Claims 1 through 17, 20 through 27, and 30 through 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness predicated upon Munarriz et al. ("Munarriz") (US 2002/0156871) in view of Kadyk et al. ("Kadyk") (US 6,895,425).

B. Claims 18 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness predicated upon Munarriz et al. ("Munarriz") (US 2002/0156871) and Kadyk et al. ("Kadyk") (US 6,895,425) in view of Wener et al. ("Wener") (US 2006/0085429).

C. Claims 19 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness predicated upon Munarriz et al. ("Munarriz") (US 2002/0156871) and Kadyk et al. ("Kadyk") (US 6,895,425) in view of Gorty et al. ("Gorty") (US 2005/0171996).

VII.   ARGUMENT

GROUPING OF CLAIMS

For the convenience of the Honorable Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences ("Board"), Appellants do not separately argue the patentability of any dependent claim. Instead, the patentability of all dependent claims stands and falls with their respective independent claims, i.e., independent claims 1, 10, 15, and 25.

A.   CLAIMS 1 THROUGH 17, 20 THROUGH 27, AND 30 THROUGH 34 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY MUNARRIZ IN VIEW OF KADYK

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention under any statutory provision. In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner is required to provide a factual basis to support the obviousness conclusion. *In re Warner*, 379 F.2d 1011, 154 USPQ 173 (CCPA 1967); *In re Lunsford*, 357

F.2d 385, 148 USPQ 721 (CCPA 1966); *In re Freed*, 425 F.2d 785, 165 USPQ 570 (CCPA 1970). Further, in rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) it is incumbent upon the Examiner to establish the requisite motivation. As maintained by the Supreme Court of the United States in *KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727 at 1741, an obviousness "analysis should be made explicit." See, *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (C.A. Fed. 2006) ("[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusions of obviousness"). Indeed, the Examiner is required to make specific factual findings, not generalizations. *See M.P.E.P. §2144.08 II. A. 5.* That initial burden required by procedural due process of law has not been discharged.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a plurality of transactions taking place between the gateway and the server." Independent claims 10, 15, and 25 recite a similar feature. For example, by way of example, in FIG. 7A, gateway 16 communicates with IMAP Server 68 using a plurality of transactions as depicted by reference numeral 54 via interface B. Thus, these multiple transactions clearly occur between the gateway and the server.

The Examiner acknowledged that Munarriz lacks any teaching of "a plurality of transactions taking place between the gateway and the server" and relied on Kadyk, particularly col. 3, line 60 through col. 4, line 5, to cure this deficiency of Munarriz. However, Kadyk merely discloses program modules including routines, programs, objects, components, data structures, etc. that perform particular tasks or implement particular abstract data types, where computer-executable instructions, associated data structures, and program modules represent examples of the program code means for executing steps of Kadyk's methods. The particular sequences of the executable instructions or associated data structures represent examples of corresponding acts for

implementing the described functions. But Kadyk fails to disclose or suggest, either in the cited portion, or any other portion, the claim feature of a plurality of transactions taking place between the gateway and the server." The mere disclosure in Kadyk of instructions that cause a computer to perform a certain function or group of functions does not constitute a disclosure, or even a suggestion, of transactions, much less a "plurality of transactions," that take place "between the gateway and the server," as claimed. The instructions of Kadyk only cause a device to perform functions. They do not constitute "a plurality of transactions taking place between the gateway and the server."

At page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserted that col. 3, lines 46-60 of Kadyk "discusses an expert proxy." This portion of Kadyk recites,

> FIG. 1 illustrates a network 100 that represents a suitable operating environment for the present invention. The network 100 includes a plurality of wireless devices 110 including wireless devices 110a through 110d which communicate over a wireless network 120 with a server computer system (hereinafter, "expert proxy server") 130. It will be understood that the present invention may be readily applied using other types of "wired" devices as well. The choice of technology for communication with such wireless or wired devices ("devices") is not critical. The expert proxy server 130 may communicate over an external network 140 such as the Internet with a plurality of server computer systems 150.

Thus, Kadyk describes a network 100 including wireless devices communicating over a wireless network 120 with an expert proxy server 130. However, not only does Kadyk not describe a "gateway," as claimed, wherein a client transmits a single self-contained request to the gateway via the wireless network to retrieve a set of e-mail related information from the server, with the gateway retrieving at least the e-mail related information from the server via the broadband network, Kadyk also fails to disclose or suggest that these functions are achieved by "using a **plurality of transactions** taking place between the gateway and the server," as claimed. Therefore, the mere disclosure by Kadyk that wireless devices may be connected via a wireless

network to some type of server, is substantially different from suggesting the explicitly claimed "plurality of transactions taking place between the gateway and the server" and the use of such plurality of transactions in the manner claimed.

Moreover, the rejection lacks the requisite motivation for making the proposed combination. The Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to combine Munarriz and Kadyk "by using Kadyk's method of sequencing commands to retrieve the email of Munarriz, because by combining it allows for simplified and smaller devices (Kadyk, Col. 2 lines 19-23)" (Final Office Action-page 4). Appellants respectfully disagree.

There is no suggestion that Kadyk's method of using an expert proxy server as an agent for wireless devices would have any applicability to Munarriz's system, especially with regard to retrieving e-mail messages. Moreover, the Examiner's rationale for concluding obviousness, *viz.*, allows for simplified and smaller devices, is a mere generalization, falling far short of the "articulated reasoning with some rational underpinnings" required by the U.S. Supreme Court, *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 82 USPQ2d 1385(2007). Thus, it is clear that the Examiner's rationale is based on impermissible hindsight gleaned from Appellants' own disclosure and, as such, is improper within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Based on the foregoing, it is apparent that Kadyk neither discloses nor suggests the features of the claimed invention that are admittedly missing from the primary reference to Munarriz. Therefore, even if, for the sake of argument, the applied references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, and Appellants do not agree that the requisite basis for the asserted motivation has been established, the invention defined in independent claim 1, 10, 15, and 25 would not result.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1 through 17, 20 through 27, and 30 through 34 under

35 U.S.C. §103(a) is neither factually nor legally viable. Therefore, reversal of this rejection by

the Honorable Board is respectfully solicited.

B. CLAIMS 18 AND 28 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY MUNARRIZ AND KADYK IN VIEW OF WENER

Wener, relied on by the Examiner for an asserted teaching of a server as an Internet

message access protocol (IMAP) server, with a mailbox name and periodic determining technique

comprising transmitting a SELECT command including the mailbox name to the server, fails to

cure the previously argued deficiencies of Munarriz and Kadyk.

Accordingly, the combination of Munarriz, Kadyk, and Wener does not establish a *prima*

facie case of obviousness. Thus, the rejection of claims 18 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is

neither factually nor legally viable. Therefore, reversal of this rejection by the Honorable Board

is respectfully solicited.

C. CLAIMS 19 AND 29 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY MUNARRIZ AND KADYK IN VIEW OF GORTY

Gorty, relied on by the Examiner for an asserted teaching of a server being a Post Office

protocol version 3 (POP3) server, with a mailbox name for the mailbox, fails to cure the

previously argued deficiencies of Munarriz and Kadyk.

Accordingly, the combination of Munarriz, Kadyk, and Gorty does not establish a *prima*

facie case of obviousness. Thus, the rejection of claims 19 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is

neither factually nor legally viable. Therefore, reversal of this rejection by the Honorable Board

is respectfully solicited.

VIII. <u>CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF</u>

Based on the foregoing, it is apparent that none of the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is factually or legally viable. Appellants therefore solicit the Honorable Board to reverse each of the Examiner's rejections.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

<u>May 23, 2011</u>   <u>/Phouphanomketh Ditthavong/</u>
Date   Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
                                      Attorney for Applicant(s)
                                      Reg. No. 44658

                                      Errol A. Krass
                                      Attorney for Applicant(s)
                                      Reg. No. 60090

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 519-9952
Fax (703) 519-9958

IX.   CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A system, comprising:

a server; and

a gateway; , wherein a wireless network interconnects a device and said gateway, the device
comprising a communication client, wherein a broadband network interconnects said
gateway and said server; wherein when said client transmits a single self-contained
request to said gateway via said wireless network to retrieve a set of e-mail related
information from said server, said gateway retrieves at least said e-mail related
information from said server via said broadband network using a plurality of transactions
taking place between the gateway and the server, compiles said retrieved information into
a single self contained response and transmits said single response via said wireless
network to said communication client.

2.   The system as in claim 1, wherein said self-contained request and said single response
form a stateless request-response pair.

3.   The system as in claim 1, wherein said server is an Internet message access protocol
(IMAP) server and said gateway further comprises an IMAP client application for communicating
with said IMAP server.

4.   The system as in claim 1, wherein said server is a post office protocol version 3 (POP3)
server and said gateway further comprises a POP3 client application for communicating with said
POP3 server.

5. The system as in claim 1, wherein said server is a simple mail transfer protocol (SMTP) compatible server and said gateway further comprises an SMTP client application for communicating with said SMTP compatible server.

6. The system as in claim 1, wherein said gateway further comprises an application for monitoring e-mail traffic.

7. The system as in claim 1, further comprising a mobile operator network, wherein said gateway is an extension of said mobile operator network.

8. The system as in claim 1, wherein said single self-contained request and said single self contained response are transmitted using hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP).

9. The system as in claim 1, wherein said single self-contained request and said single self contained response are implemented using an extensible markup language (XML) structure.

10. An apparatus comprising:

at least one processor; and

at least one memory including computer program code for one or more programs, the at least one memory and the computer program code configured to, with the at least one processor, cause the apparatus to perform at least the following,

receive from a client application of a device, via a wireless network, a single self-contained request at a first interface, wherein said first interface is interconnected with said wireless network,

retrieve at least said e-mail related information from an e-mail server via a second interface and a broadband network using a plurality of transactions taking place between the

apparatus and the server, wherein said second interface is interconnected with said

broadband network,

determine to compile said retrieved information into a single self contained response, and

determine to transmit said single response via said first interface and the mobile network to

the communication client.

11. The apparatus as in claim 10, wherein the server is an Internet message access protocol

(IMAP) server, and said second interface is an IMAP interface.

12.   The apparatus as in claim 10, wherein the server is a post office protocol version 3

(POP3) server, and said second interface is a POP3 interface.

13. The apparatus as in claim 10, further comprising an e-mail traffic monitoring application.

14. The apparatus as in claim 10, wherein said single self-contained request and response are

transmitted using hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) and said first interface is an HTTP

interface.

15. A method comprising:

receiving, via a wireless network, a single request for e-mail related information, wherein the

single request is formed in a client application at a device;

retrieving at least the e-mail related information from a server via a broadband network using

a plurality of transactions taking place with the server;

determining to compile said retrieved information into a single response; and

determining to transmit said single response to said client application via said wireless

network.

16. The method of claim 15, wherein the e-mail related information is located in a mailbox on the server, wherein said request comprises a mailbox identifier (ID) and further wherein said retrieving comprises determining to log onto the server using the mailbox ID and determining to download the requested e-mail related information.

17. The method of claim 15, wherein the e-mail related information is located in a mailbox on the server, wherein said apparatus periodically determines if new e-mail is available in said mailbox and further wherein if at least one new e-mail message is available in said mailbox, said apparatus transmits a new e-mail message notification to said client application via said wireless network.

18. The method of claim 15, wherein the server is an Internet message access protocol (IMAP) server, said mailbox has a mailbox name and a periodic determining technique comprises transmitting a SELECT command including said mailbox name to the server.

19. The method of claim 15, wherein the server is a post office protocol version 3 (POP3) server, said mailbox has a mailbox name and a periodic determining technique comprises transmitting a unique identification listing (UIDL) command including said mailbox name to the server.

20. The method of claim 17, wherein said new e-mail message notification transmitting comprises appending said new e-mail message notification to a subsequent single response.

21. The method of claim 17, wherein said device is a short message service (SMS) compatible device and said new e-mail message notification transmitting comprises transmitting said new e-mail message notification to said client e-mail application using SMS.

22. The method of claim 17, wherein said device is a wireless application protocol (WAP) compatible device and said new e-mail message notification transmitting comprises transmitting said new e-mail message notification to said client e-mail application using WAP.

23. The method of claim 17, wherein for each said new e-mail message said apparatus retrieves at least a message sender and a message subject and appends said message sender and a message subject to a new e-mail list and wherein said new e-mail message notification comprises said new e-mail list.

24. The method of claim 17, wherein said apparatus determines a quantity of new e-mail messages available in said mailbox and said new e-mail message notification comprises said quantity.

25. A method comprising:

receiving from a client application in a device, via a wireless network, a single request at a first stateless interface for the e-mail related information, wherein said first stateless interface is interconnected with said wireless network

retrieving at least the requested e-mail related information from a server via a second interface and a broadband network using a plurality of transactions taking place with the server, wherein said second interface is interconnected with said broadband network;

determining to compile said retrieved information into a single response; and

determining to transmit said single response to said client application via said first interface and said wireless network.

26. The method of claim 25, wherein the e-mail related information is located in a mailbox on the server, wherein said request comprises a mailbox identifier (ID) and further wherein said

retrieving comprises determining to log onto the server using the mailbox ID and determining to download the requested e-mail related information.

27. The method of claim 25, wherein the e-mail related information is located in a mailbox on the server, and wherein the method further comprises:

periodically determining if new e-mail is available in said mailbox; and

if at least one new e-mail message is available in said mailbox, transmitting a new e-mail message notification to said client application via said wireless network.

28. The method of claim 25, wherein the server is an Internet message access protocol (IMAP) server, said mailbox has a mailbox name and a periodic determining technique comprises transmitting a SELECT command including said mailbox name to the server.

29. The method of claim 25, wherein the server is a post office protocol version 3 (POP3) server, said mailbox has a mailbox name and a periodic determining technique comprises transmitting a unique identification listing (UIDL) command including said mailbox name to the server.

30. The method of claim 27, wherein said new e-mail message notification transmitting comprises appending said new e-mail message notification to a subsequent single response.

31. The method of claim 27, wherein said device is a short message service (SMS) compatible device and said new e-mail message notification transmitting comprises transmitting said new e-mail message notification to said client e-mail application via SMS.

32.   The method of claim 27, wherein said device is a wireless application protocol (WAP) compatible device and said new e-mail message notification transmitting comprises transmitting said new e-mail message notification to said client e-mail application using WAP.

33.   The method of claim 27, wherein the method further comprises:

for each said new e-mail message, retrieving at least a message sender and a message subject
and determining to append said message sender and a message subject to a new e-mail
list, wherein said new e-mail message notification comprises said new e-mail list.

34.   The method of claim 27, wherein the method further comprises:

determining a quantity of new e-mail messages available in said mailbox, wherein said new e-
mail message notification comprises said quantity.

35. - 37.   (Canceled)

X.   <u>EVIDENCE APPENDIX</u>

Appellants are unaware of any evidence that is required to be submitted in the present Evidence Appendix.

XI. <u>RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX</u>

Appellants are unaware of any related proceedings that are required to be submitted in the present Related Proceedings Appendix.